

If the FCC changes the definition of competition to limit my possible DSL provider to my ILEC, this will pose a hardship to my ability to work, make it more difficult to pursue hands-on continuing education in my line of work, as well as potentially prevent me from participating in certain hobby/leisure activities. Passing the Tauzin-Dingell bill would result in a similar disaster.

My broadband choices at home are between cable and DSL.

I can't use cable because I run servers; my and many other cable companies forbid users to host servers on their cable connections for valid technical reasons involving how cable companies set up residential cable networks.

Also, some cable providers are restricting the ability of their users to participate in VPNs; such a restriction would prevent me from working at home.

Satellite/wireless is workable but expensive for the average web surfer, and not suitable for me performing significant two-way communications (e.g., hosting servers or participating in a VPN). Therefore, my only option is DSL.

As a result, changing to a one-cable-provider vs. one-DSL-provider sort of competition is no competition at all.

It's not easy for me to find compatible DSL providers and ISPs. Some DSP providers and ISPs have placed restrictions on DSL service and usage.

My ILEC wants to use some of the bandwidth of their DSL customers to support its own content communications services, whether the customer wants those services or not.

I recently switched my ISP because they sold their DSL business to a provider who would have required me to sign a gag-order-style confidentiality agreement in order to get DSL service from them. I've had to be careful in choosing among the many ISPs and DSL providers and fortunate in finding ones that provide me with the DSL options I require.

Other options important to me are uplink speed and static IP addresses; competition in the DSL provider and ISP marketplaces provides me with a static IP and an acceptable upload speed for my DSL service from vendors at prices I can afford.

However, I can't predict how many restrictions my ILEC, DSL provider, ISP, or the FCC or Congress will place upon DSL service in the future, so I must constantly watch out for changes.

If I had only one choice of a DSL provider or associated ISP, as this proposal seems to favor, any future restrictions on terms of service could prevent me from performing my employment duties and hobby activities.

If I were prevented from running servers or participating in a VPN from my DSL service, I couldn't work from home as I currently do and I couldn't set up mail servers, web servers, list servers, and other servers that both meet personal needs and also give me hands-on experience in my line of work, and I would have no alternative in a single-provider world.

My protection against unacceptable restrictions is competition; if I don't like one DSL provider's or ISP's restrictions, I can switch to another provider and/or ISP.

I and my colleagues have had difficulties with some of our respective broadband providers and Internet service providers, ranging from poor service to bankruptcy. If someone has difficulties with a provider, s/he currently can switch to another ISP and/or broadband provider. This would not be possible under the proposal being considered.

Restricting ISP service on DSL to the ILEC's ISP is a mistake; I would never use my ILEC's ISP for any services whatsoever since I can easily find many other ISPs that provide me much better service for my DSL service. If the current situation changes as proposed, I would be stuck choosing between an ISP completely unacceptable to me and no ISP at all.

Space in the central office and access to the lines between the central office and my home should be available to any DSL provider and ISP who can arrange to be in that business. Don't limit competitive access to these resources.

Thank you for considering my comment.